



D2

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS  
425 Eye Street N.W.  
ULLB, 3rd Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20536

File: EAC-01-236-51485 Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: JAN 31 2003

IN RE: Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:

Petition: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)

**PUBLIC COPY**

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

INSTRUCTIONS:


This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office that originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,  
EXAMINATIONS

  
Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the director and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The director's decision will be withdrawn and the matter will be remanded for further action and consideration.

The petitioner is a business engaged in software development and technical consulting. It has two employees and a projected gross annual income of \$500,000. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a programmer/analyst for a period of three years. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the ability to employ the beneficiary in the proffered position.

On appeal, counsel submits a statement and additional documentation.

Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b), provides in part for nonimmigrant classification to qualified aliens who are coming temporarily to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation. Section 214(i)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1184(i)(1), defines a "specialty occupation" as an occupation that requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent) as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States.

Pursuant to section 214(i)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1184(i)(2), to qualify as an alien coming to perform services in a specialty occupation the beneficiary must hold full state licensure to practice in the occupation, if such licensure is required to practice in the occupation. In addition, the beneficiary must have completed the degree required for the occupation, or have experience in the specialty equivalent to the completion of such degree and recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions relating to the specialty.

The director has based the decision on the concept of "speculative employment." There is no support for the exploration of this concept per se in either the statute or the regulations. Similarly, the director has questioned the petitioner's ability to pay the beneficiary's offered wage. Wage determinations and the enforcement of their payment with respect to the H-1B classification are the responsibility of the Department of Labor. Therefore, the director's objections to the approval of the petition have been overcome on this one issue.

The director has not determined whether the proffered position is a specialty occupation or whether the beneficiary qualifies to perform services in a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the matter

will be remanded in order to make such a determination and to review all relevant issues. The director may request any additional evidence he deems necessary. The petitioner may also provide additional documentation within a reasonable period to be determined by the director. Upon receipt of all evidence and representations, the director will enter a new decision.

**ORDER:** The decision of the director is withdrawn. The matter is remanded for further action and consideration consistent with the above discussion and entry of a new decision which, if adverse to the petitioner, is to be certified to the Associate Commissioner for review.